ISSUE PA

Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education: An Examination of Alternative Federal Roles

Congressional Budget Office
Congress of the United States
Washington, D.C.

[illegible]

[illegible] was prepared by Steven [illegible] under the supervision of [illegible] William Fischer. Mary Richardson Bo[illegible] under the supervision of Johanna Zacharias. [illegible] Division [illegible] the reproduction of this paper.

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	$8,176
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	+2,772	+2,750
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	+1,397	+1,[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	-105
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	+451	+567
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	+1,522	+1,002
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	+3,330
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	+22,358	+21,610

	For General Student Population
[illegible]	31,000
[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	1,000
[illegible]	1,000
[illegible]	
[illegible]	1,000
[illegible]	1,3336
[illegible]	1,000

[illegible]

[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]
			[illegible]
[illegible]		142	9,672
[illegible]		142	7,711
		[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	142	12,268
[illegible]		142	11,506
1,1[illegible]	21,[illegible]	142	32,786

---

a/ Totals may not add due to rounding.

b/ One consolidation proposal, that of Senators Domenici and Bellmon, authorizes an incentive payment which, if fully funded, would add $567 million to the Fiscal Year 1982 current policy budget. The distribution of this payment among the various federal education and training programs is left to the states.

[illegible]

[illegible]

A number of choices about the direction of federal involvement in education will be available to Members of Congress with primary responsibility for policy in this area--the authorizing committees, who shape the legislation; the budget committees, who set overall spending targets; and the appropriations committees, who recommend the final allocation of funds among the programs. This paper examines the current federal role in elementary-secondary education, what is known about its effects on state and local agencies, the federal budget, and the students served by federal programs, and the [illegible] and assessments of some alternative major policy [illegible] that the Congress will be [illegible] in the coming years.

THE [illegible]

Three [illegible] continue to dominate the debate over the federal role in education.

> Local control of schools. The public school enterprise in the United States is deeply rooted in the concept that decisions on education, particularly those relating to curriculum and resource allocation, should be made at the local level. While the states have always been involved to some degree, they

[1] The General Education Provisions Act provides for an automatic one-year extension of authorizing legislation if action is not taken by the conclusion of the regular session ending prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in which the program expires.

[illegible] secondary school [illegible] and the Court [illegible] prohibited [illegible] between church and state [illegible] limited to [illegible].

[illegible] public schools. Closely tied to the [illegible] local control of education [illegible] concern [illegible] control of pupil assignment. Many parents [illegible] interference by any level of government in their decisions about where [illegible] their children will be educated.

[illegible] schools [illegible] government. [illegible] the Court has ordered that a particular activity [illegible] implemented in [illegible] recommended [illegible].

[illegible] private schools. The Supreme Court has continued during the last two years to limit sharply the ways in which public monies can fund services to children in church related schools. The Court has disapproved the provision of auxiliary services (for example, remedial instruction, counseling, and speech and hearing services) and the loan of instructional material and equipment to sectarian schools; however, it has reaffirmed that the loan of textbooks is permissible under certain conditions (Meek v. Pittenger, [illegible]). [illegible] both public and [illegible] constitutional [illegible].

[illegible] the general [illegible] created by [illegible] not intended to be, nor should they be [illegible] definitive interpretation of the law in this [illegible].

[illegible]

[illegible] Fiscal Year 1977 appropriation [illegible] Amendments of 1974 authorized the [illegible] for supplementary educational services, [illegible] and local educational agencies, drop-out pre- [illegible] demonstration projects to improve nutrition [illegible] (ESEA) Title III; Title V; and Title VIII, [illegible] Each state is allotted on a formula basis [illegible] divided in three areas. The consolidati[illegible] the total funds to the [illegible] fiscal year [illegible] 1977.

[illegible]

[illegible] Table 1 illus- [illegible] elementary-secondary education [illegible] federal, state, and local funds. In fiscal year [illegible] made up 7.8 percent of total, slightly less [illegible] 1981, the first year substantially affected

[illegible]

[illegible] the elementary and secondary level in 1975, [illegible] the last decade, the state share in financing elementary and secondary education increased from approximately 40 percent in fiscal year 1970, and the local share had correspondingly decreased to about 52 percent.[11] However, this proportion varies considerably by state. The National Center for Education Statistics estimates that federal revenues constituted 21.2 percent of the total funds spent on education in Mississippi in 1975-76, and only 3.8 percent in Massachusetts [illegible]. The variation among [illegible] levels [illegible] ranging from [illegible] percent [illegible] percent [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

[illegible] is [illegible] revenue sharing funds spent by state [illegible] only available to local governments beginning in fiscal year 1977) appear here as state funds. According to the Office of Revenue Sharing, in fiscal year 1975 states spent 60 percent, or $1.51 billion of their federal revenue sharing funds on education. Approximately 67 percent of all state funds from all non-categorical sources that were spent on education were devoted to elementary-secondary services. Using these approximate rates to reallocate funds to their initial source, the federal share [illegible] percent and the state share [illegible] percent.

[illegible]

[illegible] Title I funds to districts with [illegible] poverty families, appears to [illegible]. Title I funds go to urban and rural districts in [illegible] poverty than would be expected if they were distributed randomly. Title I expenditures are, on average, neutral [illegible] the wealth of the recipient district. Because [illegible] percent) of federal [illegible] the [illegible] characteristics [illegible] and federal effort [illegible] the [illegible] percent of the federal [illegible]

[illegible] Impact Aid program are dramatically different from those of Title I. Payments [illegible] districts with low property values and low median family incomes. "B" payments and districts with low property wealth to a slightly greater extent than would be expected if they were randomly distributed but with much higher family incomes than [illegible]. All parts of Impact Aid favor suburban [illegible].

[illegible] Alan E. Pattern of Federal Aid to School Districts. [illegible] Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, HEW, February 1976.

[illegible] districts in this [illegible] pattern of aid payments [illegible] where parents are [illegible] property. However, these districts [illegible] "hold harmless" [illegible] in the 1973 amendments intended to ease them out of the Impact Aid program.

[illegible]

[illegible] Federal dollars [illegible] local spending is [illegible] the objective of Federal spending. If the [illegible] state and local resources, [illegible] Federal dollars received by a district will result [illegible] total expenditure. If the addition of [illegible] non-Federal [illegible] is expected if less than [illegible] more resources have been expended in [illegible]

[illegible] the greatest [illegible] particularly if the matching rate in- [illegible] in local funding. Straight aid appears [illegible] assistance.

[illegible] to which this general observation is applicable [illegible] is not clear. Matching grants are [illegible] stimulating expenditures when they are applied [illegible] in which services have previously been minimal [illegible] levels of state and local expenditures, [illegible] amount of Federal funds which can be expended [illegible] limited. These conditions are not met by [illegible] Federal education programs.

[illegible]

[illegible] dollars for every [illegible] for the disadvantaged [illegible] the handicapped at even a rate of [illegible] education dollars are, for the most [illegible] and local [illegible] and are therefore [illegible] Interstate allocations [illegible] districts [illegible] and the level of [illegible] direct relationship to [illegible] for increased [illegible] and [illegible] education profession. [illegible] grew out of concern about [illegible] federal influence on state and local spending.

[illegible] the broad policy education question about [illegible] spend additional discretionary money is [illegible] by Stephen Barro and Stephen Carroll of RAND [illegible] Barro and Carroll examined the way in which school [illegible] patterns changed when budgets were increased.

[illegible], "What is the Role of Federal Assistance [illegible] Report No. GAO 75-31, December [illegible] 1975.

[illegible] Stephen J. Carroll, Budget Allocation [illegible] Teachers and [illegible] RAND [illegible], December 1975.

[illegible]

[illegible] Service (ESS) [illegible] compensatory pro- [illegible] students in the sub- [illegible] for reading abili- [illegible] and information on [illegible] were obtained during the [illegible] substantially increased our [illegible] about the Title I program.

[illegible] Title I [illegible] While there is some contro- [illegible] intended for economically [illegible] pupils (see footnote [illegible] are clearly a high [illegible] that schools receiving [illegible] students also scored [illegible] In Title I schools, 51 [illegible] were reading one or more [illegible] compared with 37 percent in schools with [illegible] funded from non-federal sources. Of the [illegible] in Title I compensatory programs, 64 per- [illegible] participation in the free lunch program, selection [illegible] based on family income. A greater proportion of [illegible] Title I programs were non-white than in other [illegible]

[illegible] Title I [illegible] supplementary, as intended? Resources [illegible] compensatory students were greater in every case than [illegible] non-compensatory students in schools either [illegible] Title I programs. As classes became smaller or [illegible] compared with compensatory students, resources [illegible] Title I students were also more likely to [illegible] specialized reading groups.

[illegible] Title I [illegible] compensatory students [illegible] the number of [illegible] one of the methods chosen by researchers at RTI to [illegible] was to compare the number of correct responses by compensatory students [illegible] correct responses by noncompensatory students [illegible] school year covered the period [illegible] at the fourth and sixth grade levels. For example, compensatory students increased their number of correct responses from 70 percent to 76 percent of the correct answers of students in schools without compensatory programs at the fourth grade level and 13 percentage points at the second grade level. There is no evidence that Title I students who have gained in ability during a school year [illegible] their gains during the summer; a study of this question is in progress.

Do Title I programs improve student attitudes toward learning? In contrast to earlier analysis of data from the 1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey which found disadvantaged students progressively more fatalistic about the benefits of education as they proceeded through the schooling process, RTI researchers found that "compensatory students become increasingly more favorable towards themselves as readers and in their liking for reading activities and improve more in these attitudes than do noncompensatory students (within each of grades 4 and 6 only). As a result they come to equal or surpass their peers in this regard by the close of the academic year." 7/

These RTI conclusions do not necessarily lead to unquestioning support of Title I programs, but they do indicate that Title I is more successful than was previously believed.

Education for the Handicapped. The federal involvement in the education of handicapped students is in the process of substantial change. Formerly, funds were available for a variety of special efforts, including searching for and identifying previously unserved students. A relatively small amount of support was also available for general services. Beginning in 1978 (advance funded

7/ U.S. Office of Education, Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation, "A Study of Compensatory Reading Programs: A Technical Summary," Washington, D.C., 1976, p. 12.